REMARKS

The reference numbers of the July 2, 2008 Office Action will be used in this response for ease of reference by the Examiner.

Examiner's Comments:

1. The request for continued examination has been entered and is acknowledged.

35 USC § 103:

1. Claims 6, 12, 14-18 and 19-27 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kazumi (JP 02-904593) in light of Buckmaster (US 4,714,756, hereinafter "Buckmaster "756"). Applicant disagrees and in addition to the following arguments reiterates the arguments of Applicant's June 9, 2008 response.

The Examiner states that Kazumi teaches the method disclosed in the present invention with the exception of PFA being fluorine treatment stabilized (page 2 of the 7/2/08 Office Action) and adhesion promotion (page 3 of the 7/2/08 Office Action). Kazumi discloses in [0003] the problems arising from a beginner pouch "**not being adhered** to the interior surface of the container body". [0004] discusses alternatives to the inner pouch (electrostatic coating and sheet lining) and the problems associated with these approaches. In [0005] Kazumi states that "in view of these problems, the present inventors proposed in their application, Japanese Patent Application H2-338899, a lining technology which called for rotating the metal vessel body while it was heated and introducing a thermally fusible fluororesin into said vessel body." This is all by way of background to inform the reader of the state of the art. This is clear also from the title of this section, which starts at [0002], "Prior Art".

The Examiner makes reference to [0003] and [0005] of Kazumi as the problems to solve in the present invention. Applicant disagrees because the problem solved by Kazumi is stated explicitly in [0006] entitled "Problem to be Solved by the Invention", as being bubbles in the resin layer formed in rotolining. There is no mention of adhesion being the aim of the Kazumi invention. Additionally, [0009] Kazumi restates the aim of his invention, being to prevent bubble formation while suppressing deposition on the resin layer surface of the fine powder used to suppress bubble formation. Again nothing is said of adhesion being an aim of the Kazumi invention.

The Examiner contends that Buckmaster discloses a method of preparing melt-processible TFE/PAVE copolymer to be used in rotomolding where PFA copolymer is treated with fluorine to stabilize the copolymer to reduce bubbling of the PFA during heat process (2:33-38). Claims 6, 12, 14-18, and 19-27 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kazumi in light of Buckmaster. The Examiner states, regarding claims 6, 19-23, and 26-27, that Kazumi teaches rotolining with a composition of PFA [0016] and non-bubble promoting [0007] metal powder [0016-0017]. Applicant disagrees.

It is Applicant's claims 6 and 20 that disclose a "non-bubble **promoting** metal powder". In contrast, Kazumi discloses mixing metal powder in a fluororesin to "**suppress** bubble generation" [0007]. According to Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Tenth Edition, ***promoting*** is defined as "launching" whereas ***suppress*** is defined as "arrest or check". Applicant contends that the present invention does not have bubble formation and is proactive in making sure this does not occur. In contrast, Kazumi is solving a bubble formation problem [0006] and seeks to "arrest" those bubbles that would otherwise form spontaneously. The Examples of Kazumi state that gas bubbles do not remain in the PFA [0017]. Thus, Kazumi solves the problem of bubble formation in the PFA layer, meeting the invention objective. Because Kazumi solves the bubble formation problem, there would be no motivation to additionally adopt Buckmaster's solution to the bubble formation problem, i.e. polymer fluorination. This would merely add cost without providing benefit. Since Kazumi and Buckmaster both address bubble formation in rotolining, it would not make sense to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the inventions of adding metal powder and fluorination, respectively, particularly from an economic standpoint (increasing cost for no benefit). (See page 9, *Ex parte Rickevich,* Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, 29May2007) Hence, Kazumi provides no motivation for combining his methodology with that of Buckmaster.

The Examiner states that the combination of Buckmaster and Kazumi has a low metal content (less than 2 wt%). Applicant reiterates the metal powder wt% optimization argument from its June 9, 2008 response. Buckmaster teaches the desirability of having **low metal contamination** in PFA (col. 1, lines 48-57) even to the extent of avoiding use of thermoplastic processing equipment in preparing the PFA granules (col. 2, lines 39-42). Therefore Buckmaster's process is to prepare PFA with low metal contamination that teaches away from the adding of metal powder taught by Kazumi to suppress bubbling. In the fluoropolymer art, metal contamination is a matter of parts per million or parts per billion. See US 7,122,609 column 2, line 66 – column 3, line 2) and US 6,623,680 (column 4, lines 26-33),

respectively. It is metal at these concentrations that Buckmaster has in mind in referring to low metal contamination. The percent level metal content of Kazumi would defeat Buckmaster's purpose.

For the above reasons, claims 6, 20, 24 and 25 are believed to be non-obvious and in allowable condition. Claims 12, 14-19 and 21-23 and 26-27 are dependent therefrom and are thus, believed to be non-obvious for the same reasons as claims 6 and 20. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

2. Claims 8-9, 13, and 28-30 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kazumi in light of Buckmaster '756 and further in light of Saito et al. (US 5,397,831). Applicant disagrees and in addition to the following arguments reiterates Applicant's arguments of the June 9, 2008 response.

Applicant reiterates the arguments raised above in reference number 1 with regard to claims 6 and 20. In view of the non-obviousness arguments discussed above of the claims from which claims 8-9, 13, and 28-30 are dependent, the addition of Saito which discloses creating a layer with a film thickness and the use of tin, would not yield the present invention.

A petition under 37 CFR § 1.136 for an extension of time to respond to the Examiner's action is not believed required. However, if this or any other fee is due in order to obtain consideration of this response, please charge that fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1928 (E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company.)

In view of the foregoing, allowance of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

TAMERA L. FAIR
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT
Registration No.: 35,867
Telephone: (302) 892-7948
Facsimile: (302) 992-3257

Dated: October 2, 2008